



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON FIVE NEW MANUSCRIPTS OF THE COMMENTARY OF DONATUS TO TERENCE

BY MINTON WARREN

WHILE engaged in a search for Terence manuscripts last year, I came across in Rome five manuscripts of Donatus which seem to have escaped the notice of scholars, and which were not used by Wessner in his recent admirable edition. One of these, which I designate as *I*, is in the Vatican (Pal. Lat. 1629, cod. chart. 29 × 20 cm.), three others are in the Corsini library (43 G. 13, cod. chart. 31 × 20 cm. = *H*, 43 G. 23, cod. chart. 29 × 22 cm. = *Q*, and 43 E. 28, cod. chart. = *S*). All of these are probably of the late fifteenth century. The Vatican ms. has very long and full *subscriptions* written in Italian, often difficult to decipher, at the end of each play, giving in each case an exact date for the finishing of the play, viz. *Andria*, Aug. 27, 1474, *Eunuchus*, Sept. 4, *Adelphoe*, Sept. 17, *Hecyra*, Sept. 22, *Phormio*, Sept. 27. This order of plays is followed in the other codices. As a specimen I give one of the shorter *subscriptions*, that of the *Andria*. Huius scene p'me Ambros Umbsich per instantiam (?) del magnifico Capitano Bartholomeo Coglioni¹ de Bergamo in casa de Innocenti Cotta overo nel hosteria dela Spada nel luogo de porta Romana et anchora alodi (a Lodi?) al tempo dela rehedificatione del castello chiamato Porta Grobia del Signore duca con Milano. Scripsi a di xxvii di Agosto 1474 a hora xxiiii pro othoïanu aluthā guerā de bresca. Other *subscriptions* are still more curious, but are too long to quote here. The initials at the beginning of each scene are ornamented with scrolls, with short legends in German often containing geographical names, as Ingolstadt, Bayern, Elsas, etc., so that the ms. must have some connection with Germany. Although palaeographically very interesting, the text is very corrupt. In the test passages given by Wessner, Vol. I, *Praefatio*,

¹ Bartholomeo Coglioni, of whom there is a famous equestrian statue in Venice, held the office of Captain-General from June, 1458, until his death on November 3, 1475. See Oscar Browning, *Life of Bartolomeo Colleoni*, p. 35.

pp. xxx ff., it invariably agrees with the *libri deteriores*, but in those given on p. xli, it sometimes agrees with *ABV*. As a rule, Greek words are omitted except where given with Latin letters, as *ethicos*. This is true also of the other codices named above. Nevertheless *I* has some good readings which go to show how mixed is the manuscript tradition of Donatus. I can only cite here a few of its readings, giving page and line of Wessner's edition.

I, 16, 1 reperta, accepted by Wessner from ed. princeps, *ATCFV* repetita; 9, 16 terentius libo libertus alter libertinus; 14, 6 appocis = appotis, a reading credited to Leo, but first proposed by Bentley; 17, 2 illotos; 19, 20 Acio (Actio *V*²); 20, 9 claudicarit (cf. *V*²); 29, 20 chlamys (clamis codd.); 35, 8 ex partibus patrum priorum (cf. *V*²); 36, 13 aspecta with *A*; 49, 7 peritiam (*V*²); 51, 11 prodat and *in mg* pandat = *V*; 54, 15 admirabiliter (*V*²); 60, 6 eclypsis pulchra (*V*²); 104, 1 insitus est (cf. *V*); 61, 6 traxerit is omitted, *V* has traxerat.

Of the mss. in the Corsini library *H* and *Q* agree with the *libri deteriores*, *S* usually with these, but occasionally with the *meliores*, and it is noteworthy that at the end of the Phormio it has (fol. 294 r)

Aelii donati v. c. oratoris urbis Romae commentarium in Terentii Phormione explicit, cf. Wessner, *Praefatio*, p. ix. The scribe of *Q* was too modest to give his name. At the bottom of fol. 192 v is written

nomen meum non pono quia laudare nolo Amen.

and at the end of the codex, fol. 293 v,

nomen non ponam quia laudare nolo.

So far as I have examined their readings these mss. (*S*, *Q*) have very little value.

H, which is perhaps the latest of all these, and which indeed in the old catalogue of Rossi (under number XXIII) is credited to the sixteenth century, has at the end of the Andria the *alter exitus*, which I have now found in eleven other mss. besides those known to Umpfenbach. These I propose to treat in a separate paper. *H* is so late that it may have been influenced by some printed edition, and I shall only cite a few of its readings. Wessner, *I*, 3, 12 flore, but on margin
 † gratia
 † forma; 3, 14 Cornelius Nepos; 5, 6 de numeratione (cf. *A*); 7, 9 vigesimum, but on margin trigesimum; 8, 17 non similem with *A*; 9, 2 milone for Limone; 14, 1 praesuli for praesidi; 14, 6 a poetis with *A*; 17, 3 illotis, but on margin al in iocis, the accepted reading for which

Wessner cites no MS. In the lemma on *And.* 607 it has *qui me hodie perdidit*. Bentley refers to this reading as given in MSS. and I have found *hodie* in at least a dozen Italian MSS.

THE CODEX CHIGIANUS

Far more important than the manuscripts named above is the manuscript in the library of Prince Chigi which bears the signature H. VII, 240, is of paper and measures 28 × 20 centimetres.¹ I designate it as *K*.

In the written catalogue it is called *Terentius cum commentariis*, but no mention is made of Donatus. The catalogue dates it in the thirteenth century, which seems to me too early. The first two leaves are certainly later, probably of the fifteenth century, and two, possibly three, hands have been concerned in the writing of the remainder of the ms. which ends on fol. 143 r. Catch-words I have noted at the bottom of fol. 10 v, 20 v, 32 v, 42 v, 52 v, 62 v, 79 v (see below), 89 v, 99 v, 104 v (see below), 114 v, 124 v, 138 v. The commentary to the *Andria* ends on fol. 33 v, *Adelphoe* 59 r, *Eunuchus* 95 r, *Hecyra* 121 r, *Phormio* 143 r. On fol. 62 r the text ends in the middle of the page with *tremulus* (Wessner, I, p. 343, 21 = *Eun.* 336), the rest of the page and 69 v are left blank, and there follow two blank leaves unnumbered, but fol. 70 r begins in a different hand with *pro*, the next word after *tremulus*. After 104 v, which ends in *abesse* (Wessner, II, 236, 3 = *Hec.* 245), there is another blank leaf, and 105 r begins with *nuptam* and in a different hand. The order of the plays in the commentary is very significant (*And.*, *Ad.*, *Eun.*, *Hec.*, *Ph.*). The only other MS. of Donatus in which the *Adelphoe* follows the *Andria* is the Codex Parisinus 7920 (*A*) of the eleventh century which is justly regarded as the most important manuscript of Donatus. Unfortunately it only extends as far as *Ad.* 1, 1, 40. The

¹ This library is open only on Thursdays (not holidays) from 9-12. I have to thank the American Ambassador, George von L. Meyer, for permission to use the library obtained through him from Prince Chigi. Owing to lack of time my notes were taken hurriedly, but I trust they are fairly accurate. I have examined the *Andria* with more care than the other plays. Dr. Robert Kauer, to whom I communicated my discovery, has made a further examination of the manuscript, and kindly permitted me to make use of it while deposited for a time in the library of the Austrian Institute in Rome.

above order, however, is ancient, for it was known to Priscian, who in his treatise *De Metris Terentii* follows it in citing the first lines of the prologues and first scenes (cf. Keil, III, p. 423). We may conclude then that if other correspondences are found in which *A* and *K* agree they go back ultimately to the same archetype. Of such correspondences, partial or complete, I cite the following, giving page and line of Wessner's edition.¹

I, 50, 13 arete; 51, 19 inde decore; 55, 2 poeneste; 56, 6 intellegit om. *KA*; 14 quo *A* and scholia to Parisinus 7899; 57, 11 anastra; 58, 12 plerūque; 59, 4 multos om. *AK*; 9 panpolla; 67, 24 temporavit; 70, 3 edicta; 76, 13 i. c. f.; 85, 19 et ut; 90, 5 siit (so Wessner in text, sit *A*); 91, 5 fingā; 92, 4 impeditum, 5 pristinum; 94, 3 hac chidibus; 95, 7 in possum abit; 103, 11 putaverat, 12 quō, 15 ita nec, 17 glicere *K*¹; 107, 7 rescisceret; 111, 19 educ; 113, 9 vicendat, 11 merito; 114, 15 ubi; 115, 14 ad immanium; 117, 19 abea (habea *A*); 120, 1 attentius; 126, 4 leviandum; 136, 18 attilli (at illi *A*); 139, 13 certa (certe *A*); 143, 6 convenio; 152, 21 ilucitum ei; 155, 8 dic; 156, 21 causa m. a.; 162, 13 capit; 172, 6 macran; 173, 18 abstrahatur; 178, 7 excidicia; 194, 10 se dum osce clareo; 195, 20 numeri; 199, 17 dec irato; 207, 4 ineptum est; 223, 1 chantharam; 238, 10 tilis; 240, 10 tiberem (ceberem *A*); 242, 4 ain unde sit; 247, 9 causas; 249, 9 hic situr b.; 254, 16 scrupet in q. t.; 255, 7 ut poete *K*¹; 260, 5 a n h.

In many other passages *K* has the same reading with *AV* or with *V* alone. Here it is to be noted that *K* omits I, 319, 3 OMNIA — p. 322, 17 habitabant, which in *V* is supplied on margin by *V*². In the following passages *K* agrees with *V* alone according to Wessner.

¹ It should be stated that folia 1 and 2 contain the Vita of Terence by Petrarch, a summary of the acts of the different plays in the order *And.*, *Eun.*, *Haut.*, *Hec.*, *Ph.*, *Ad.*, not the order of the codex itself, and a discussion of the virtues *Prudentia*, *Fortitudo*, *Temperantia*, and *Iustitia*. Compare *Donat. Comm. And.* 30, where I gives *prudentia iustitia fortitudo et temperantia* (so Donatus ed. Klotz) instead of *prudentia, iustitia, patientia, fortitudo* (Wessner). Fol. 31, in an older hand, begins with the Vita of Donatus, then follow (Euanthius *de Fabula*) *Initium*, etc., and *de Comedia*, to the bottom of fol. 6v which ends with *quod populo* (Wessner, I, 30, 9). Here probably two leaves have fallen out, and the next leaf begins with *sic dixit* (Wessner, 48, 3).

I, 8, 1 e; 70, 10 pro unam fortunam; 74, 13 quam; 75, 3 fiat (V^1); 78, 2 quod; 80, 11 et mira; 82, 2 ut — daturum om. KV ; 96, 20 admirantur; 97, 7 parit — mas, 20 numeticum; 98, 18 non vilitate; 103, 15 est facere; 17 uti; 109, 12 atque solitudinem et dolorem; 115, 19 p eũ se g. fit (the abbreviation above u might be read er , so that it would equal per everse, cf. A); 122, 15 magis consuetudine; 126, 2 addidit; 10 et duc; 161, 17 prodiris; 169, 3 pronuntiatum sum; 179, 10 cum; 183, 11 declinare; 190, 2 tydide c. (titide c. V); 198, 11, adiceret; 343, 14 Tyresiat' si (cf. TC); 377, 22 sinunt (sint C , si nunc V); II, 229, 18 et pipides (for Εἰρηίδης); 267, 19 puto felineos (in $mg.$ vel felineos V).

In many passages where V^2 has corrected the text K coincides with V^1 . Thus I, 63, 19 subest; 113, 22 meminerat; 180, 8 loco; 487, 20 ergo. In some passages where the reading of V^1 cannot be made out, K in all probability preserves the original reading which is sometimes found in no other ms. Worthy of notice in this respect are the following examples. Many more might be given. I, 69, 18 collisus (collisio V); 76, 15 permanes; 99, 11 multarum; 101, 13 a minoribus; 16, afficiendo; 102, 7 non; 117, 17 te tulerit; 120, 15 geminatio amatorie; 126, 1 tale; 130, 20 effectum; 134, 12 negato vidisse; 141, 18 caveas; 143, 7 dicturi; 146, 16 me cum; 148, 14 adnupta; 154, 14 deiuret; 158, 19 additur; 168, 7 destinationem; 173, 9 nota sis; 178, 14 plena uxorē; 197, 1 et illi aptum; 21 promoveri; 206, 1 nimis; 486, 24 ut persona eius cōvenigeri. Compare the emendation proposed by Heraeus, *Woch. f. Kl. Phil.*, 1903, 266, *ut personae eius convenit geri*.

In the test passages given by Wessner, *Praefatio*, I, p. xli, K agrees with ABV against TC , with AB against TCV (except in *And.* 542 where it has *vitabant* the correct reading with TCV), with AV against BTC , with ATC against BV^1 . So, too, in the passages given by Wessner, *Praef.* xxx–xxxii, it agrees invariably with the *meliores libri*, but in *Ad.* III, 4, 47, it deserves to be noted that it has *contra* for *adversus* with the excellent lost *Codex Cuiacii*. In *And.* 861 it omits *vel indulgentia loquitur* with AB . A close correspondence with B is seen in I, 202, 12 *pro sene scelere*, and many other instances might be cited. In I, 106, 12 K^1 had *voluit nolit*, but *voluit* which is the reading of TC has been crossed out, *nolit* the correct reading of the other mss.

has been kept. Just before in l. 9 *K* has *dicebam* with *A T C*. Glosses and variants there must have been in the archetype of *K*, which accounts for its occasional agreement with *T C* which are reckoned with the *libri meliores*. *K* agrees with *T* in inserting before the scenes the names of the characters. This is not done in the *Andria* and *Adelphoe*, so that unfortunately we cannot compare *K* with *A* in this respect. Spaces are left in these plays between the scenes, but the names have not been filled in. This begins to be done with *Eun.* III, 1, shortly after a change of hand. From this point on the headings agree substantially with those reported by Wessner, *Praef.* xlviii f., except where I note differences. I give, however, small letters for capitals.

Eunuchus.

III, 1 Traso, Gnato, Parmeno.

2 Thais, Traso, Parmeno, Gnato, Phitias (an order agreeing with the Victorianus of Terence).

IV, 1 Doris, Ancilla.

4 Phedria, Dorus, Phitias (*T* omits Phitias).

7 Traso, Gnato, Sanga, Siricus, Dorax, Cremes, Thais (here fuller than *T*, but not agreeing with any of the Terentian MSS. *Dorax* for *Donax* is found in the text of Terence in several MSS.).

V, 2 Cherea, Thais, Pithias (*T* against the MSS. has Pithias before Thais).

3 Pitias, Cremes, Sofronja (om. *T*).

4 Parmeno, Pitias (om. *T*).

v. 943 Pithias, Parmeno (a new scene begins here in *PFC* and the Dunelmensis of Terence).

5 Laches, Parmeno (om. *T*).

6 Pithias, Parmeno (om. *T*).

7 Gnato, Traso (om. *T*).

8 Cherea, Parmeno, Gnato, Traso, Phedria (om. *T* and not agreeing in the order with any Terentian ms.).

Hecyra.

I, 2 Parmeno, Philotis, Sira (wanting in Wessner's list).

II, 1 Laches, Sostrata (wanting in W.).

2 Phidippus, Laches, Sostrata (wanting in W. — order agrees with Bembinus and γ class).

III, 1 Pamphilus, Parmeno, Mirrina (wanting in W.). Mirrina is however crossed out. This is due to the fact that a new scene subsequently began as in *V* at III, 1, 38 = 318 (cf. Wessner, *Praefat.* xlix) before *Tace obsecro*, etc., where Mirrina is again inserted. I have found a new scene beginning at this point in the following late mss. Vat. Ottobonianus 2022, Vat. Barb. 16, 82, and 133. The following, however, begin the new scene before *Tace* in v. 314, Ottobon. 1365, Florence, Laurent. LII, 24, and Conv. Sop. 50, 15.

III, 2 Sostrata, Pamphilus, Parmeno (wanting in W., and not agreeing with Terentian mss.).

3 Pamphilus adolescens (wanting in W.).

4 Parmeno, Sosia, Pamphilus (wanting in W.).

IV, 1 Myrrina, Phidippus = *B*, Wessner.

In the remaining scenes of the *Hecyra* no headings have been inserted, and they are comparatively rare in the *Phormio*. I give only divergences from Wessner.

I, 1 Davus, Geta.

2 No space for a new scene.

II, 3 Demipho, Senex.

III, 1 Omitted.

3 Phedria.

IV, 2 Lacking.

4 Antipho.

5 Demipho, Cremes.

V, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 the heading is lacking as in *R*.

In the preservation of Greek words and citations *K* is superior to most mss. of Donatus and in a few cases to all, but here, too, the practice as in the case of the scene-headings is very uneven. In the *Andria* e.g. the Greek words are often omitted. They seem to me best preserved in the *Hecyra* from Act II, s. 2, soon after the change of hand on fol. 105 r. In fact, the scribe who filled in the Greek has several times written on the margin *Pinxi*, and in one place *Pinxi hos apices grecos*. Elsewhere e.g. opposite *Phorm.* 68 and 87 is written *grecum deest*. Sometimes the Greek is written wholly or in part with

Latin letters. I give some examples which may be compared with Wessner's critical apparatus. I, 68, 2 $\dot{q}s$ vocēne (cf. *A* and *V*); 86, 8 digna via (= digamma); 93, 1 te perifrasi; 97, 5 paramō ea (cf. para mo ea *A*, pari modo ea *V*); 137, 6 syno doche tropos; 151, 15 yronicos; 163, 8 methaforicos (= *V*); 170, 7 methalempsis; 181, 14 p eufenus mon; 229, 13 pro sto (= πρὸς τὸ); 235, 21 silempsis (*AV*); 239, 2 parato olein (cf. *A* and *V*); 253, 17 asindetos; 278, 1 protasi (cf. *B*); 282, 3 adauxes inducens = ad αὐξῆσιν ducens; 298, 19 nú mesin (cf. *V*); 315, 17 promuthion (cf. *V*); 329, 3 hyperbole; 19 trophimon (= *V*); 358, 2 attice; 383, 18 enī epiteton (cf. *V*); 465, 5 per hec fonesin; 496, 3 figurata dilogia. Vol. II, 208, 26 ma (other mss. all give *una*, and Wessner attributes *μᾶ* to Stephanus). The following Greek, however, μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα, *K* omits. 217, 25 dum auseris; 228, 23 dinotes; 267, 17 mira chonos. I cannot here cite all the passages, which I have noted, where the Greek is given as Greek. Often *K* coincides with *A*, *B*, or *V*, or one of the presumably lost codices to which Wessner refers. Sometimes it offers a better reading and sometimes it stands alone. The passages given below in the order of their occurrence have been selected in part to show the agreement of *K* with other mss., in part to show its divergence or superiority, but for the ms. variants I must refer the reader to Wessner. I have given accents and breathings only as they occur, (W) following the number of the line indicates that the Greek in *K* is identical with Wessner's text.

I, 55, 15 αξιολαλ (cf. *V*, here λα is for M as repeatedly in this ms.); 16 the same, but in 103, 1 a te more (*pro* omitted); 112, 24 λῦξετο; 217, 16 εχει Ναισ (*AB*); 452, 9 verve enim το velle significat, which rather favors *iubere enim τὸ velle*, cf. Stephanus. II, 241, 7 (W); 242, 7 (W); 243, 21 (W); 245, 14 ἀπάρχεσ ἀρχιτελοῦσ; 25 μόλις (*cod. Cuiac.*); 247, 5 ade ἀλιπτικῶς (cf. *V*² and adelphicos *C*). This does not tend to support ὑπαλλακτικῶς Steph. 248, 6 ἐξεκταστικε υποκρισις, 7 διαλεκτικῶς ὑτιολοτικῇ ὑποκρίσις, 9 σκηματιστὸν ἔπος (*V*²) ἀνακόλουθον (so also 254, 1); 254, 4 ἐχαρκτηρισμος (*V*); 256, 15 αἱ ἀπορεσις τί πρὸτον ἔπιτα τῷστάτον καταδέξω, Wessner, Lindenbr. (*ex. cod. Cuiac. ut videtur*) ***** codd.; 257, 9 (W); 10 σετλιασμόν; 258, 22. Here again *K* is superior to any known existing codex. For both the Homeric and the Apollodorus passage

Wessner is dependent upon Lindenbrog. In the Homeric passage (*Od.* 18, 136 f.) ἔχουσιν is given for ἐστίν, and after οἶον, ἐπι βαρ-
 γησ' ἐπατην ἄρων τε θεωντε. The Apollodorus passage reads οὗτος
 ἕκαστος διὰ τὰ πρᾶγματα σέμνος ἡμῶν καὶ τάπινος differing from
 Lindenbrog in having ἡμῶν for ἦεν. Cobet conjectured ἡμῶν for
 οὕτως, cf. Kock, III, p. 284, and Wessner's Appendix where other
 conjectures are given. The corresponding Terence passage, *Hec.* 380,
 reads :

Ōmnibus nobis út res dant sese, ita magni atque humilés sumus.

Perhaps we should read :

οὕτως ἕκαστός ἐστι διὰ τὰ πρᾶγματα
 ἡμῶν τε σεμνὸς καὶ ταπεινός.

268, 18 ευφεγέσις (*V*) ; 270, 2 and 21 (*W*) ; 279, 1 and 19 as *V* ;
 282, 3 διατιρῆσις (cf. *BV*) ; 283, 5 as *V* ; 289, 5 ἡθικ' closer than *B*
 or *V* to ἡθικῶς *Steph.* ; 289, 13 and 16 as *V* ; 293, 26 as *V* ; 300, 1 as
V ; 301, 1 as *V* ; 314, 23 as *V* ; 324, 2 (*W*) ; 327, 19 καταπλήξις
 μετααπλῆς ἀποσιώπησις, the last word in no other codex, cf. *W* (κατα-
 πλήξις is also found 376, 14 and 377, 16 in *W*, but omitted by *K*) ;
 334, 24 and 335, 1 a mimetico ad dihegematicon et συντόμωσ ; 335,
 24 οἰκωμωμικὴ διανοία, the reading οἰκονομικῇ διανοίᾳ is due to Stephanus ;
 336, 23 ἐξαριθμηψίσις ; 338, 17 and 19 (*W*) ; 339, 14 as *V* ; 342, 4
 (*W*) ; 347, 1 (*W* except πρότον) ; 350, 10 (*W*) ; 353, 15 et περιφραστι-
 κῶς et ἀντι τοῦ (sic) ; 354, 4 ἀντιτοῦ ; 16 (*W*) ; 357, 3 and 13 (*W*) ;
 359, 1 ἀσυνδεδος, 8 ἐλλυψις I (= *R*) ; 360, 2 ἐφεξέγεσις (cf. *V*), 7
 ἰδιοσίμω ; 361, 2 (*W*) ; 364, 1 ἀποσιωπήσις II, 5 ἀνελλυψις for *An*
ἐλλευψις ; 366, 5 (*W*), 6 et est ἀποσιώπησις om. *K* ; 371, 7 (*W*) ; 372,
 2 ⁱⁱⁱⁱ παρέλκον ; 372, 5 προσάντια διάστολην ; 373, 13 om. *K*, but
 in mg. *grecū deest* ; 19 παρήακον (quartum om. *K*) ; 21 παρηακον ⁱⁱⁱ ;
 374, 1 παρέλκον—plerumque om. *K* ; 4, significat παρήακον (cf. *R*) ;
 379, 5 and 12 (*W*) ; 380, 7 um αἵρεσις αἵρησ dicitur, but αἵρεσις is
 crossed out ; 384, 6 om. *K*. I am sorry to say that my notes on the
Phormio stop at this point and I have none on the Greek in the
Adelphoe.

NEW FRAGMENT OF APOLLODORUS OF CARYSTUS

I have already given some instances where *K* preserves Greek not found in any of the extant codices, but in *Hecyra* 620 *K* has Greek attested for no other MS.¹

Wessner's text reads: NOS IAM FABVLAE SVMVS ἀμανρά. However, ἀμανρά is an emendation of Schoell. *B*, the only MS. which has kept any trace of the Greek, has NANPA (cf. however Sabbadini, *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, II, p. 131). *K* reads as follows:

nos iam f. s. πὰν ἀρσομοδο
ρο μύθοσ ἐσμεν δὴ πάμφιλε γρὰυς γιρον.

The *εν* of *εσμεν* is represented by an abbreviation, the *υς* of *γρὰυς* by a ligature. Before πὰν, παρ was written and then crossed out. I give only such accents as are found in *K*. We should separate, I think, ἀρσομοδορ ὁ μῦθος, and ἀρσομοδορ I believe to be the result of successive corruptions of *Apollodorus*, written now as Greek, now as Latin. In *Phorm.* 87 we find in *K* *Appollodor'* (with two *p*'s) just as *Hec.* 550 *K* has ἥθικ' for ἥθικῶς, and this may account for the loss of *us*. ρ stands for *p* as *p* for *ρ* in the curious corruption *et pipides* given above for Εὐριπίδης (*Hec.* 214). Compare also *And.* 406 where *pontes* is found in several MSS. (also in *K*) for *ποντες*. Finally, μ (*M*) is a corruption, which may be very ancient, of ΛΛ. Compare *And.* 57, where for *mira* ἔλλειψις (probably written as elsewhere ἔλλυψις) *K* has *mire musis*, *T*¹ *C*, *mire missis* (*V*² has *eclipsis pulchra* in ras). The corruption must antedate the eleventh century as *A* has *mire misis*. Compare further *And.* 149, ΕΜΙΥΙC in *A*; *And.* 300 *est*; *Misis* in *A*; *And.* 872 Ε·ΛΛ·Ι·Υ·ΙS in *A*. How now are we to explain the παν which precedes ἀρσομοδορ and how NANPA in *B*? In *And.* 447 *B* has TONNPENON for τὸ πρέπον, in *And.* 798 ΠΠENON for πρέπον, and if one will consult Wessner's critical apparatus on *And.* 350, 423, 696, 950, *Eun. Praefatio*, 1, 8 (Wessner, I, 266, 18), *Eun.* 14, 405, etc., one will find numerous examples in *A*, *B*, and other MSS. of the interchange of Π and Ν, so that in the archetype of all our

¹ On the other hand, the Apollodorus' passages quoted by Donatus, *Hec.* 1, 1, 1 and 2, 1, 17, are omitted in *K*.

mss. they must have been easily confused. NANPA therefore may stand for ΠANPA and PA may be due to a transposition of AP in ἀρσομοδορ.

Returning for a moment to Terence. Recent editors, despite the mss. and Donatus, following Guyet, read :

postrémo nos iam fábula
sumus, Pámphile, 'senex átque anus'

although *A* divides the verse after *sumus*. *Fabula* is strongly confirmed by the Greek ὁ μῦθος. With substitution of ἤδη = *iam* and a slight transposition we may perhaps read :

ὁ μῦθός ἐσμεν Πάμφιλ' ἤδη γραῦς γέρων

or keeping δῆ

ὁ μῦθός ἐσμεν δῆ γέρων γραῦς Πάμφιλε.

The explanation of παν is not far to seek. As it precedes ἀρσομοδορ it cannot be part of the Greek quotation, for Donatus does not thus intercalate a poet's name. παν must therefore stand for the Latin letters *p a n*, which were thought to be Greek and were written as Greek, just as we find in *V, Eunuchus* 634 ἀναφερέσις written for *An ἀφαίρεσις*, and in *K, Phor.* 52 ἀνελλυψις for *An ἐλλυψις*. In *K, fabulae sumus* is represented by *f. s.* At some stage in the transmission the words following *sumus*, of which the Greek original is given, namely, *Pamphile* 'senex atque anus,' were probably represented by the initials *p. s. a. an*' (for *anus*) or *an*, for often the first two letters of a word were written. Compare Wessner, II, 229, 2, LI. CO. changed in mss. to *loco*; II, 230, 2, *ab. s.* in mss. *abis*; I, 142, 21, *du. i.* in *B* for *dubium id.* The cases, however, are numerous where the ignorant scribe, for whom these initial letters had no meaning, omitted some of them, especially when the same letter was repeated. Thus *f. s. p. s. a. an* would easily be corrupted to *f. s. p. an*, and then *p. an* to *pan*, παν. Some may prefer to see in *pan* a corruption of *pam* in *Pamphile* (written *Panphile* as sometimes in the mss. of Terence), but I prefer the first explanation for this reason. I believe that the σ in ἀρσομοδορ is due to the fact that some scribe noticed that *s* for *senex* after *P* for *Pamphile*

had fallen out and inserted it carelessly after the wrong P (ρ). I would read then in our passage :

NOS IAM f. s. p. s. a. an. Ἀπολλόδωρος ‘ὁ μῦθος ἐσμεν Πάμφιλ’
ἤδη γραῦς γέρων.’¹

¹ For a somewhat fuller and slightly different treatment of this passage see *Classical Philology*, I, pp. 43-46. I have there given reasons for not accepting παρ’ Ἀπολλοδώρῳ as being contrary to the usual method of citation of Donatus. If παρ’ Ἀπολλοδώρῳ be accepted, the most natural reading would be

μῦθος ἐσμεν ἤδη Πάμφιλε
γραῦς γέρων

i. e. parts of two trochaic verses, as has been suggested to me by several correspondents after the above article had already reached final page proof (March 15, 1906).